

REMARKS

The present amendment and remarks are in response to the Non-Final Office Action entered in the above-identified case and mailed on May 16, 2011. Claims 1-37 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 8-15, 20-26 and 32-37 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 7,086,009 to Resnick, et al. (hereafter “Resnick”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,926,177 to Hatanaka et al. (hereafter “Hatanaka”). Claims 2-7, 16-19 and 27-31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Resnick in view of Hatanaka and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,485,600 to Joseph et al. (hereafter “Joseph”). With this response Applicants have amended independent claims 1, 15 and 26 as well as dependent claims 2-6, 11, 13, 16-19, 22-24, 27-31, and 34-36. With the present amendment Applicants respectfully submit that all of the pending claims are now in condition for allowance.

As presently amended, each independent claim includes features that are not taught or suggested in the prior art. Each of the independent claims now calls for, among other things, a display or graphic object that includes a plurality of graphic or visual representations of a process entity. The graphic or visual representations are adapted to be displayed to a user on a display device when the display or graphic object is executed on a processor. Different graphic representations of the process entity are displayed when the display object is executed in different contexts or for different purposes.

None of the references cited by the Examiner, alone or in combination, teach or suggest a display or graphical object that includes a plurality of different graphical or visual representations of a physical or logical process entity. Furthermore, none of the references cited by the Examiner, alone or in combination, teach or suggest displaying different graphical or visual representations of a process entity when a display or graphical object is executed in different contexts or for different purposes. Because the references cited by the Examiner do not teach or suggest these features of the amended independent claims, the amended independent claims and all of the claims depending therefrom are not unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) and should be allowed.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that all of the claims pending in the application are now in condition for allowance. If the Examiner has any questions regarding the present response he is encouraged to call the Applicant's attorney at the number provided below.

Dated: September 22, 2011

Respectfully submitted,

By /Jeffrey H. Canfield #38,404/
Jeffrey H. Canfield
Registration No.: 38,404
MARSHALL, GERSTEIN & BORUN LLP
233 S. Wacker Drive
6300 Willis Tower
Chicago, Illinois 60606-6357
(312) 474-6300
Attorney for Applicant